

VZCZCXYZ0010
PP RUEHWEB

DE RUCNDT #0550/01 1751912
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
P 231912Z JUN 08
FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 4474

UNCLAS USUN NEW YORK 000550

SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [PTER](#) [UN](#)

SUBJECT: GENERAL ASSEMBLY COUNTER-TERRORISM
STRATEGY-FACILITATOR CONVENES CONSULTATIONS

¶1. Summary. Informal consultations on the General Assembly's Counter-terrorism Strategy follow-up focused on plans for the September review. Delegations struck a positive tone and comments were generally constructive. The current trend is toward a resolution reaffirming the Strategy. Some delegations are pushing to establish a General Assembly Working Group or other mechanism to monitor implementation and direct Secretariat efforts. The establishment of a small Task Force Co-ordination Office within the Secretariat also continues to be an issue two years after the resolution mandated it. End Summary.

¶2. On June 13, 2008 Ambassador Gert Rosenthal, Permanent Representative of Guatemala, in his capacity as facilitator of the review process of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, held an informal meeting open to all Member States and Observers. Delegates engaged in a preliminary exchange of views on the expected outcome of the September 4 meeting convened by the President of the General Assembly, in compliance with Resolution 60/288. Rosenthal identified four issue areas of particular relevance for discussion:

a. Whether delegations felt that the four substantive pillars of the Strategy merited further discussion or were susceptible to a broad reaffirmation?

b. What additional steps would be required to improve implementation and to give the Strategy further impetus?

c. What institutional issues require further clarification which including:the role of the Task Force, its budgetary implications, the manner in which it interacts with the General Assembly, and what further steps are required to marshal all the resources at the disposal of the United Nations to implement the Strategy?

d. What type of outcome document should be adopted at the September 4 meeting?

With regard to the assessment of progress since 2006, the main item mandated for the 2008 meeting, the facilitator said that he had been informed by the Secretariat that the note/report of the Secretary-General concerning what has been accomplished since the adoption of the Strategy would be available by the second half of July.

¶3. Comments, views and concerns were presented by the following delegations: Pakistan, who spoke of behalf of the OIC and also on behalf of its own delegation; Slovenia on behalf of the EU, Egypt, Canada on behalf of CANZ, Qatar, Japan, Panama, Switzerland, Norway, Liechtenstein, Cuba, Mexico, Indonesia, Israel, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom, Colombia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Turkey, United States, Peru and Syrian Arab Republic.

Most delegations said that their comments were preliminary and that more concrete views would be forthcoming after the report of the Secretary General was issued. There was a

clear pattern in the interventions. Virtually all speakers recognized the singular achievement that the 2006 Strategy represented, and the majority favored a general reaffirmation, rather than a new debate on the contents. Concern was expressed, however, on two matters: the first was the importance of adopting further steps to implement the Strategy at the national, regional and global level; the second was the institutional aspects. On the latter, there were differing points of view on how to make the Secretariat's work more transparent and accountable, as well as how to enhance interaction between the General Assembly and the Counter-terrorism Task Force.

¶4. Delegations indicated they were looking forward to receiving the Secretary General's report. Some said that future review processes would be necessary. Many commented about the "institutionalization" of the Task Force. Different ideas on mechanisms to meet more frequently to share information and provide guidance were mentioned. Some stressed the need to implement the Strategy in an integrated, comprehensive and more balanced manner. In the view of some delegations (Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria) additional aspects of the Strategy required more attention such as root causes, development, cooperation, information sharing and capacity-building.

¶5. On the expected outcome, there was broad support for a resolution, although some delegations found it too early to decide on such a matter. For those who supported the idea of a resolution, there was a trend toward a short, substantive and focused document reaffirming the Strategy and enhancing the Strategy to allow an effective and full implementation. They also noted the need to clarify the interaction of the Task Force with Member States and

resource requirements.

With regard to the resource requirements of the Task Force, several delegations stressed the importance of resolving this matter before the September 4 meeting. The EU and U.S. said that this should be achieved in accordance with GA Resolution 60/288 which stipulated "existing resources". In addition, comments were made concerning the need for more support and cooperation with the Security Council counter-terrorism bodies.

Some views on the format of the meeting of September 4 were also presented, indicating the wish to have an interactive debate on the steps needed by Member States to implement the Strategy including best practices.

Khalilzad